

I am writing in opposition to HR 4026.

I am very upset with the attempts of mainstream media to limit satellite radio. A large number of radio stations in the larger markets today are controlled or modeled after Clear Channel communications. This may be fine if you want to hear the same song 3 times per hour. Not to mention the total lack of variety that these stations provide. Mainly "shock jocks" and "talk shows" in the mornings with virtually NO music and many many commercials. I pay a nominal fee to avoid the talk, to hear the songs I WANT TO HEAR and avoid commercials. This is not free. I pay for this service. I think the sheer number of subscribers is testament to the fact that satellite radio is catching on and appeals to listeners who enjoy music and despise commercials and nonsensical talk.

To prevent satellite radio from providing local traffic and weather on demand is also suspect. The local stations do it only sporadically and only when colored and mixed with other commentary. XM provides instant access to current weather and traffic without having to wade through talk and commercials. When I am planning a drive to work I want to know right then what the traffic situation is, not wait past 3 teasers and 5 minutes of commercials to get to a traffic report that is already 30 minutes old and totally incomplete.

I see this as similar to allowing satellite TV providers to provide local channels to their subscribers. This has not devastated cable or broadcast TV. Why should satellite radio be any different? Why is this different from Cable TV providing local weather? That is a pay service similar to a satellite feed over the airwaves?

Please vote against HR 4026.

SHAWN A THOMAS MD
TYLER TX